



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,660	10/12/2006	David E. Luzzi	UPNA-0083	6650
23377 7590 07/21/2010 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER MILLER, DANIEL H	
			ART UNIT 1783	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/21/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/582,660	Applicant(s) LUZZI, DAVID E.	
	Examiner DANIEL MILLER	Art Unit 1783	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/15/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/11/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's arguments are persuasive in light of amendments to the claim. The restriction has been withdrawn and claims 1-58 have been examined together below.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

Art Unit: 1783

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/720,562. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they teach the same major elements including carbon nanotubes coated in silica with the same additional constituents with little to any difference in the structural language of the two claims. No patentable distinction is seen.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 1783

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by (US PG PUB 2007/0128440).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

PG PUB. '440 teaches the substantially identical structure including a nanotube structure with bioreactive structures (see claims 1-20). No patentable distinction is seen.

5. The material of PG PUB '440 is substantially identical to applicant's and the has functional moieties (see examples), amongst other components that would be considered to be "*capable of absorbing bio-reacting molecules*" as claimed. *No patentable distinction is seen.*

Claims 1-5, 8 and 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Saitoh WO 2004/abstract translation provided cited as equivalent disclosure is (US PG PUB 2006/0052509) wherein material other than abstract is cited. It is noted that the present application has been deemed to not get priority back to the US provisional application because the basic silica nanotube structure is not disclosed nor is the

Art Unit: 1783

specific embodiments claimed. Applicant did not appear to be in possession of the currently claimed invention at the time of filing of the US provisional priority document.

6. Saitoh teaches providing a carbon nanotube composition that contains a conducting polymer (a) or heterocyclic compound trimer (i), a solvent (b) and carbon nanotubes (c), and may additionally contain a high molecular weight compound (d), a basic compound (e), a surfactant (f), a silane coupling agent (g) and colloidal silica (h) as necessary; a composite having a coated film composed of the composition; and, their production methods (see abstract translation WO '893).

7. Saitoh teaches a carbon nanotube material coated with or cross-linked with colloidal silica (see abstract and [0098]). The compound comprises heterocyclic trimers that are considered to meet applicant's claimed biofunctional molecule (see [0036-0056]), to the extent to which applicant has defined that term. No patentable distinction is seen.

8. There are no particular limits on the nanotubes of Saitoh from single walled to multi-walled nanotubes (encompassing double walled; see [0074-0075]).

9. The composition of Saitoh is considered to be to some degree porous. No patentable distinction is seen. The composition of Saitoh is considered to provide a medicament to the extent to which applicant has defined that term.

10. The material of Saitoh is substantially identical to applicant's and the trimer molecules has functional moieties (see examples of Trimers), amongst other

Art Unit: 1783

components that would be considered to be “*capable of absorbing bio-reacting molecules*” as claimed. No patentable distinction is seen.

11. Claims 1 and 23, and 38-40, 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372).

12. Klein teaches [0021] a tubular nanostructure of the present invention comprises a tubular body having a hydrophobic region flanked by hydrophilic regions. While either or both of the hydrophilic regions may be located at the ends or inward from the ends of the tubular body, it is preferred that at least one of the hydrophilic regions is located at an end of the tubular body, and more preferably, that both hydrophilic regions are located at the ends of the tubular body. As a structure for forming a pore in a lipid bilayer membrane, and more preferably a cellular membrane, the tubular body of the present invention is preferably sized in its diameter and length with reference to the membrane to be penetrated [0021].

13. The tubular body may comprise carbon nanotubes [0024] and translates molecules across the lipid bilayer (see detailed description specifically [0027]).

14. The addition of biocompatible moieties to the surface (ends) of the nanotube are specifically discussed for interacting with the lipid bilayer (see [0026]).

15. The material of Klein is substantially identical to applicant's and the hydrophobic region has functional moieties (see examples), amongst other components that would be considered to be “*capable of absorbing bio-reacting molecules*” as claimed. No patentable distinction is seen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 23-46, and 49-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitoh WO 2004/039893 abstract translation provided, further citations provided from equivalent disclosure of (US 2006/0052509) in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372).

18. Saitoh teaches providing a carbon nanotube composition that contains a conducting polymer (a) or heterocyclic compound trimer (i), a solvent (b) and carbon nanotubes (c), and may additionally contain a high molecular weight compound (d), a basic compound (e), a surfactant (f), a silane coupling agent (g) and colloidal silica h) as necessary; a composite having a coated film composed of the composition; and, their production methods (see abstract of WO document translation).

19. Saitoh teaches a carbon nanotube material coated with or cross-linked with colloidal silica (see abstract and [0098]). The compound comprises heterocyclic trimers that are considered to meet applicant's claimed biofunctional molecule (see [0036-0056]), to the extent to which applicant has defined that term. No patentable distinction is seen.

Art Unit: 1783

20. There are no particular limits on the nanotubes of Saitoh from single walled to multi-walled nanotubes (encompassing double walled; see [0074-0075]).

21. Although Saitoh discusses the desire for water solubility of nanotubes in the art (see background), a trait necessary and desirable for interaction with the lipid bilayer, Saitoh is silent as to the method of using the article in a lipid membrane and a biofunctional component in conjunction with that use.

22. Klein teaches [0021] a tubular nanostructure of the present invention comprises a tubular body having a hydrophobic region flanked by hydrophilic regions. While either or both of the hydrophilic regions may be located at the ends or inward from the ends of the tubular body, it is preferred that at least one of the hydrophilic regions is located at an end of the tubular body, and more preferably, that both hydrophilic regions are located at the ends of the tubular body. As a structure for forming a pore in a lipid bilayer membrane, and more preferably a cellular membrane, the tubular body of the present invention is preferably sized in its diameter and length with reference to the membrane to be penetrated [0021].

23. The tubular body may comprise carbon nanotubes [0024] and translates molecules across the lipid bilayer (see detailed description specifically [0027]).

24. The addition of biocompatible moieties to the surface (ends) of the nanotube are specifically discussed for interacting with the lipid bilayer (see [0026]).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the silica coated article of Saitoh in order to preserve the properties of the nanotube and provide the property of solubility (as desired by the primary

Art Unit: 1783

reference Saitoh; see background) and additionally modify the reference by specifically providing a biocompatible or otherwise bioreactive molecule as taught by Klein to employ the material as a pore for interacting with and embedding in a lipid bilayer as desired by Klein. No patentable distinction is seen.

26. The combined product of Saitoh and Klein are considered porous (as they would be expected to function as a pore to move molecules through the lipid bilayer, as taught by Klein. The nanostructure of Klein is further considered to be a medicament as claimed as it interacts with the lipid bilayer. No patentable distinction is seen.

27. Saitoh teaches colloidal silica but is silent as to the geometry of the particle including spherical. Saitoh does discuss the particles having a range of diameters (see [0100]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the silica coated article of Saitoh with spherical particles given that the particles with a specific diameter would either be spherical or non-spherical and that one of ordinary skill would consider both and provide the most effective coating for the application through routine experimentation. No patentable distinction is seen.

28. Claims 6-7, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitoh WO 2004/039893 abstract translation provided, further citations provided from equivalent disclosure of (US 2006/0052509); in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372) further in view of Erianger (US PG PUB 2005/0069947).

29. Saitoh (US 2006/0052509) in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372) are silent as to the presence of C60 or Horseradish Peroxidase.

Art Unit: 1783

30. Erianger discusses the use of nanotubes or Fullerene (C60) as in biological application wherein they can be made soluble [0004 and figures]. Erianger teaches that Horseradish Peroxidase is commonly used to provide markers for the fullerene or nanotube biological material and devices in order to detect them, separate the perform analysis [0136 and 0137-0138].

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide C60 fullerenes in the side walls (with one embodiment involving bonding with silane groups as in Saitoh) of the nanotube because it would have been obvious to mix to materials both known (as disclosed by Erianger) to be useful for the same purpose (biological devices) and it would further have been obvious to provide Horseradish Peroxidase is commonly used to provide markers for the fullerene or nanotube biological material and devices in order to detect them, separate the perform analysis [0136 and 0137-0138]. No patentable distinction is seen.

32. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitoh WO 2004/039893 abstract translation provided, further citations provided from equivalent disclosure of (US 2006/0052509); in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372) further in view of Schlaf (US 2005/0241374).

33. Saitoh teaches providing a carbon nanotube composition that contains a conducting polymer (a) or heterocyclic compound trimer (i), a solvent (b) and carbon

nanotubes (c), and may additionally contain a high molecular weight compound (d), a basic compound (e), a surfactant (f), a silane coupling agent (g) and colloidal silica h) as necessary; a composite having a coated film composed of the composition; and, their production methods (see abstract).

34. Saitoh teaches a carbon nanotube material coated with or cross-linked with colloidal silica (see abstract and [0098]). The compound comprises heterocyclic trimers that are considered to meet applicant's claimed biofunctional molecule (see [0036-0056]), to the extent to which applicant has defined that term. No patentable distinction is seen.

35. There are no particular limits on the nanotubes of Saitoh from single walled to multi-walled nanotubes (encompassing double walled; see [0074-0075]).

36. Although Saitoh discusses the desire for water solubility of nanotubes in the art (see background), a trait necessary and desirable for interaction with the lipid bilayer, Saitoh is silent as to the method of using the article in a lipid membrane and .a biofunctional component in conjunction with that use.

37. Klein teaches [0021] a tubular nanostructure of the present invention comprises a tubular body having a hydrophobic region flanked by hydrophilic regions. While either or both of the hydrophilic regions may be located at the ends or inward from the ends of the tubular body, it is preferred that at least one of the hydrophilic regions is located at an end of the tubular body, and more preferably, that both hydrophilic regions are located at the ends of the tubular body. As a structure for forming a pore in a lipid bilayer membrane, and more preferably a cellular membrane, the tubular body of the

Art Unit: 1783

present invention is preferably sized in its diameter and length with reference to the membrane to be penetrated [0021].

38. The tubular body may comprise carbon nanotubes [0024] and translates molecules across the lipid bilayer (see detailed description specifically [0027]).

39. The addition of biocompatible moieties to the surface (ends) of the nanotube are specifically discussed for interacting with the lipid bilayer (see [0026]).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the silica coated article of Saitoh in order to preserve the properties of the nanotube and provide the property of solubility (as desired by the primary reference Saitoh; see background) and additionally modify the reference by specifically providing a biocompatible or otherwise bioreactive molecule as taught by Klein to employ the material as a pore for interacting with and embedding in a lipid bilayer as desired by Klein. No patentable distinction is seen.

41. The combined product of Saitoh and Klein are considered porous (as they would be expected to function as a pore to move molecules through the lipid bilayer, as taught by Klein. The nanostructure of Klein is further considered to be a medicament as claimed as it interacts with the lipid bilayer. No patentable distinction is seen.

42. Saitoh teaches colloidal silica but is silent as to the geometry of the particle including spherical. Saitoh does discuss the particles having a range of diameters (see [0100]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the silica coated article of Saitoh with spherical particles given that the particles with a specific diameter would either be spherical or non-spherical and that

Art Unit: 1783

one of ordinary skill would consider both and provide the most effective coating for the application through routine experimentation. No patentable distinction is seen.

43. Neither Saitoh or Klein teach the nanotubes as part of a probe or AFM probe tip.

44. Schlaf teaches it is known in the art to provide a nanotube tipped cantilever probe tip specifically for AFM (see figures and paragraphs 002-005). The CNT probe tip offer not only extraordinary nanometer scale resolution but have high strength and ability to handle deformation [paragraph 0004].

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an atomic force microscope (AFM) tip comprising carbon nanotubes in order to allow for a AFM with extraordinary nanometer scale resolution and high strength and ability to handle deformation [paragraph 0004]. No patentable distinction is seen.

46. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitoh WO 2004/039893 abstract translation provided, further citations provided from equivalent disclosure of (US 2006/0052509); in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372) further in view of Schlaf (US 2005/0241374).and still further in view of Erianger (US PG PUB 2005/0069947).

Art Unit: 1783

47. Saitoh (US 2006/0052509) in view of Klein (US PG PUB 2004/0023372) are silent as to the presence of C60 or Horseradish Peroxidase.

48. Erianger discusses the use of nanotubes or Fullerene (C60) as in biological application wherein they can be made soluble [0004 and figures]. Erianger teaches that Horseradish Peroxidase is commonly used to provide markers for the fullerene or nanotube biological material and devices in order to detect them, separate the perform analysis [0136 and 0137-0138].

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide C60 fullerenes in the side walls (with one embodiment involving bonding with silane groups as in Saitoh) of the nanotube because it would have been obvious to mix to materials both known (as disclosed by Erianger) to be useful for the same purpose (biological devices) and it would further have been obvious to provide Horseradish Peroxidase is commonly used to provide markers for the fullerene or nanotube biological material and devices in order to detect them, separate the perform analysis [0136 and 0137-0138]. No patentable distinction is seen.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-1534. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

Art Unit: 1783

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Sample can be reached on (571)272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R. Sample/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1783

/Daniel Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 1783